



INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

INDIANA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ASSESSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 10, 2014

Indiana Government Center South – Conference Room 12
402 West Washington Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Board Members Present: Superintendent Glenda Ritz, Dr. David Freitas, Dr. Brad Oliver, Daniel Elsener.

Others Present for Part or All of the Meeting: Claire Fiddian-Green, Dr. Michelle McKeown, Danielle Shockey, Lisa Acobert, David Galvin, Shane Hatchett, Molly Chamberlain, and two planning consultants from CELT: Chris Craig and Rick Rozzelle.

Mr. Elsener welcomed everyone to the meeting. Mr. Elsener invited a motion to approve the minutes; Dr. Freitas moved and Dr. Oliver seconded. The subcommittee approved the minutes from the prior meeting on February 6, 2014.

Mr. Craig explained that a report was put together from the session and explained some things to take away from the session. He said the stakeholders were happy and gratified that there was a strategic plan underway and appreciated being brought in to give input. However, he said there was concern about two-way communication with the Board in the past. He further iterated that PR for the plan is an important part; making everyone in Indiana aware of the plan. Mr. Craig pointed out that the business people were most enthusiastic about the process while the higher education and community groups were less pleased with the process. Mr. Craig said overall it was a very positive engagement. Ms. Fiddian-Green pointed out, and Mr. Craig agreed, about the goals being broader and objectives more specific. This helped explain some of the frustration with the perceived generality of some of the goals by some of the stakeholders. Mr. Craig said the mission and vision was very well received. The subcommittee further discussed some specific stakeholder comments, including diversity and use of the word “innovation”. The subcommittee also discussed advice from experts, the

dashboard and alignment of resources for implementation. Mr. Elsener emphasized clarity and the importance of providing information to stakeholders and others.

The subcommittee decided not to break into groups on account of the fact that some subcommittee members were not present. The group discussed objectives for goal one. They also talked about looking at some other strategic plans to aid in alignment and the creation of the Board's strategic plan. Dr. Oliver expressed the importance of the Board's strategic plan being its own as well as the consideration of others. The subcommittee discussed having the stakeholders groups coming together to align with the Board's plan. The subcommittee agreed alignment is important. There was discussion of improvement of all achievement as an objective for goal one; Mr. Rozzelle expressed the need for more specifics in this and other objectives, including learning. He said there will be several objectives per goal, and then the objectives are to be broken down into one or two strategies, which are more detailed and explain the "how". Mr. Elsener said his objective would revolve around being a national leader in literacy. Mr. Craig mentioned if "national leader" is used there would need to be ways to measure the objective for input. Dr. Freitas said he preferred to bring to CELT some policy issues and then have them come back with some objectives. Mr. Craig said he thinks CELT should be cut out of the picture to a degree. Mr. Rozzelle said they don't want to build up a dependent on CELT, but that CELT will help refine.

Superintendent Ritz said when goals are made, they must be viable to the people we want to do it. Kids and parents must understand it; specific things kids are going to do. The results can be measured but the actual words must be clear for everyone to understand. Dr. Oliver said direction is needed because if there are gaps districts could fill them in with more assessments. He expressed concern over the dominant concern turning into test prep rather than learning. Mr. Craig then reiterated the difference between goals, objectives and strategies, as well as how the balanced score card is supposed to look. The subcommittee then discussed objectives as they pertain to the goal of student achievement, including assessments and standards. Mr. Craig responded those would be strategies. The group continued to discuss goals, objectives, and strategies in a broader sense, including that objectives must be measurable. They discussed literacy, STEM, and the graduation rate as possible objectives. Superintendent Ritz suggested CTE as a broader concept to address rather than STEM specifically since STEM is one of the pathways. Dr. Oliver suggested college and career readiness as a possible objective. Mr. Elsener said STEM could be a separate objective from college and career readiness. Mr. Craig said they can set objectives without current measures and then engage experts in the field to help develop metrics. Mr. Rozzelle state Indiana standards could be a strategy, and character standards could be built in. Dr. Oliver said he

wanted to start with the strategies and then let that drive the discussion. Mr. Elsener said character, citizenship, and traits should be emphasized even if not easy to measure.

Superintendent Ritz suggested an objective that all students will engage in college and career pathways to develop character and knowledge to be successful in post-secondary work. She noted within that there are many strategies. She emphasized specifying what all students will do. She went on to propose requiring all kids to read at their grade level as a strategy. Superintendent Ritz said she wanted it to be student driven. Dr. Freitas expressed the importance of multiple indicators on the dashboard. Dr. Oliver said being data driven is important, and from that look at the leading and lagging indicators. Mr. Craig stated that lagging indicators are summative and the leading indicators are tied to the strategies. Dr. Oliver suggested asking the stakeholder groups to help define the strategies that will achieve objectives, including appropriate metrics. The group summarized the objectives: CTE, STEM, character and citizenship, graduation rate, and literacy. The subcommittee then took a break.

-- RECESS --

The subcommittee reconvened and the floor was opened for suggestions regarding goal two. Mr. Elsener suggested making the education and formation of top notch innovative leaders for the K-12 system a top priority; he said this includes superintendents, principals, boards, and teachers. Dr. Oliver suggested looking at strategies on the teacher preparation track; how to attract the best and brightest talent. Dr. Oliver suggested separating teachers and leaders. The subcommittee discussed four buckets: teachers, superintendents, principals, and boards. The subcommittee then talked about some metrics to measure successes.

Superintendent Ritz said a support system in place for teacher success is important. Dr. Freitas said leaders should include teachers rather than separating it out so as not to send the wrong message. Superintendent Ritz said she liked the wording “recruiting, developing, and retaining talent.” She also added that she would like to see national board certification somewhere in there. Dr. Oliver suggested that as a strategy. Dr. Oliver also stated evaluation and improvement plans are important in a professional environment. The subcommittee considered the recruit, develop, and retain language and then discussed breaking those down into the four categories (teachers, principals, superintendents, and boards). The subcommittee then engaged in a discussion about the role of technology in the identification of strategies. The subcommittee then discussed the importance of being careful with the language used so stakeholders understand these objectives are positive; they pondered a preamble to help achieve this. The subcommittee agreed to modify the language of goal two to “maximize the potential of human talent.” The subcommittee then recessed for lunch.

-- RECESS --

Upon reassembling, the committee introduced goal sponsors and moved to a discussion of goal three. Mr. Craig explained the subcommittee's mission and vision statements. He then explained goals in general and the goals of the subcommittee. He went on to say the next step is to create objectives that are measurable and obtainable. Mr. Craig explained lagging indicators and that input from stakeholders will help define those. He then moved on to outline what needs to occur at the meeting the day after this one, including implementation and outcome indicators. The discussion proceeded to objectives for goal three (increasing the involvement and support of stakeholders). Mr. Elsener said parental involvement is the most important stakeholder group and would like a clear objective to reflect that. Superintendent Ritz suggested broadening that to include caring adults. Dr. Oliver suggested innovative partnerships with businesses, higher education, and others. Dr. Freitas opined that the second objective could be community. The subcommittee discussed local flexibility with regard to these objectives. The discussion then turned to how to foster relationships with stakeholders. The subcommittee also discussed using "family involvement" in place of parental involvement. Mr. Craig said he was hearing the first objective as increasing family involvement and the metrics would be in research. The subcommittee then discussed a second objective of local partnerships with schools. Mr. Elsener said a lot of the objectives can be tied to school improvement.

The subcommittee spoke about the expectations of the goal teams. Mr. Rozzelle laid out the agenda for the meeting the day after this one; outlining what will be presented and discussed. He said we look to the goal teams to bring their expertise to the table and establish some specifics. Mr. Craig explained strategies lay out the "hows", the specificity to explain how objectives are to be accomplished. The group then talked about what kind of strategies make sense for the objectives discussed. Mr. Rozzelle explained he would like the goal teams to work independently if possible, and further expounded on the process of the next day's meeting. Mr. Elsener expressed the importance of marketing and execution.

Mr. Elsener adjourned the meeting without objection.